



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

violated the Oregon constitution, declaring that all men when they form a social compact are equal in rights, but the court holds that this provision does not interfere with the right of the state to control and regulate the right of a minor to contract, affirming the doctrine that minors are the wards of the state, and that the Legislature may throw such protections around them as it deems necessary. The further provision that work must not be begun before seven in the morning and extend after six at night is not passed upon in this case, as the defendant was not accused of violating this provision.

Lowest Responsible Bidder.—That state boards must obey the rather common statutory injunction to award contracts to the lowest responsible bidder is sustained by the Supreme Court of New Jersey in the case of *Jacobson v. Board of Education*, 64 Atlantic Reporter, 609, and it is pointed out that in the event that the lowest bidder is not deemed responsible, a judicial determination of this point must be made, and that notice must be given to him of such proceedings, with an opportunity to be heard.

Rights of Squatters.—The Supreme Court of Texas adheres to the doctrine in force in that state that a squatter may secure title to land after ten years' possession in spite of the fact that he took possession of the land without any claim of right and with the intention of holding the land if possible against all other claims. In this case of *Link v. Bland*, 95 Southwestern Reporter, 1110, the land belonged to a railroad company, and the claimant is given title to a quarter section which he cultivated and used as his homestead. The decision conforms to previous decisions of the Texas court, and is made in spite of the statutory definition that adverse possession must be an actual and visible appropriation of the land, commenced and continued under a claim of right inconsistent with and hostile to the claim of another.

Sales—Right to Regulate Resale and Price.—Another decision on the right of a manufacturer to control the price and the manner in which an article may be sold by the retailer is found in *Hartman v. Jno. B. Park & Sons Co.*, 145 Federal Reporter, 358, where the United States Circuit Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky holds that contracts between the manufacturer and wholesalers to sell at a certain price and only to retail dealers designated by the manufacturer should be sustained. The court disposes of the defense that the contracts were unlawful, as in restraint of trade, by a holding that the restraint in order to be unlawful must be unreasonable.

Charitable Institutions—Injuries to Servants.—The Supreme Court of New Hampshire in *Hewett v. Woman's Hospital Aid Ass'n*, 64 Atlantic Reporter, 190, holds that a hospital conducted as a charity is liable for the negligence of its manager in failing to notify a nurse

of the contagious nature of a case assigned to her. The court points out that the hospital is incorporated under a general charter, and that although it has no capital stock and made no division of profits, and all its property was devoted to charitable uses, it is liable, and cites a number of English and American cases. The court also rejected the contention that as the plaintiff was an apprentice learning a trade, she was not a servant, and that the corporation was therefore relieved of its ordinary duty to her in that capacity.

Libel—Liability of Managing Editor.—The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in *Folwell v. Miller*, 145 Federal Reporter, 495, holds that the editor in chief having general supervision of the matter contained in a newspaper is not responsible for a libel of which he had no actual knowledge. It seems that the publication was caused by a subordinate during the absence of the editor in chief. The court points out that it has never been really decided that the liability of the editor is co-extensive with that of the proprietor, and declined, to approve cases which tend to hold this doctrine.

Eminent Domain—Right of Way through Cemetery.—Judge Wilkes, speaking for the Supreme Court of Tennessee in the case of *Memphis State Line R. Co. v. Forest Hill Cemetery Co.*, 94 South-western Reporter, 69, very tersely summarizes the holding of the court with the statement that "the wheels of commerce must stop at the grave." It was sought to have a right of way for the railroad condemned through a portion of the cemetery which had not as yet been used for burial purposes, for the reason that other available rights of way would be more difficult and more expensive to prepare.

Constitutional Law—Statute Discriminating against Patented Article.—An Arkansas statute providing that every negotiable instrument taken in payment for a patented article must be executed on a printed form, showing that it was so taken, is held by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit in *Ozan Lumber Co. v. Union County Nat. Bank*, 145 Federal Reporter, 344, to be unconstitutional, for the reason that it creates a discrimination between the articles of property of the same class or character, the discrimination being based on the fact alone that the article is protected by a federal patent. The court distinguishes several somewhat similar enactments in other states, and points out that, if such a statute could be lawfully enacted, the state might with equal reason destroy the negotiability of notes taken by national banks or by citizens of other states, or in interstate commercial arrangements, etc.

Carriers—Who Are Passengers?—The Supreme Court of Massachusetts in the case of *Fitzmaurice v. New York, New Haven & Hartford R. Co.*, 78 Northeastern Reporter, 418, makes a decision